



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/732,982	12/11/2003	Samuel M. Lester	200206420-1	8580

22879 7590 11/02/2007
HEWLETT PACKARD COMPANY
P O BOX 272400, 3404 E. HARMONY ROAD
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY ADMINISTRATION
FORT COLLINS, CO 80527-2400

EXAMINER

MUSA, ABDELNABIO

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2146

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

11/02/2007

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/732,982	Applicant(s) LESTER ET AL.	
	Examiner Abdelnabi O. Musa	Art Unit 2146	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11 December 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-37 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-37 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 11 December 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>12/11/2003</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. The instant application having Application No. 10/732982 has a total of 37 claims pending in the application; there are 11 independent claims and 26 dependent claims, all of which are ready for examination by the examiner.

Oath/Declaration

2. The applicant's oath/declaration has been reviewed by the examiner and is found to conform to the requirements prescribed in **37 C.F.R. 1.63**.

Priority

3. As required by **M.P.E.P. 201.14(c)**, acknowledgement is made of applicant's claim for priority based on applications filed on 12/11/2003.

Information Disclosure Statement

4. As required by **M.P.E.P. 609(C)**, the applicant's submissions of the Information Disclosure Statements dated 12/11/2003 is acknowledged by the examiner and the cited references have been considered in the examination of the claims now pending. As required by **M.P.E.P 609 C (2)**, a copy of the PTOL-1449 initialed and dated by the examiner is attached to the instant office action.

Title

The title of the invention is not descriptive. A new title is required that is clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claim(s) 1, 4-6, 8-10, 17-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ashley Patent No. (US 6,909,992 B2) and further in view of Van Der Meijs Pub. No. (US 2002/0122204 A1).

Ashley teaches all of the claimed limitations and further teaches a computer medium storing processor executable components and processor readable data that configuring an image forming device to process alerts (a computer system that has various types of computing devices including servers, storage systems processor and memory Col. 3, Line 52; Col. 4, Line 23; Col. 7, Line 7; Col. 22, Line 35; FIG. 10) comprising data store configured to store an address of one or more of, a configuration server, a posting server, and a communication server (system configuration data is stored on various physical storage locations also databases storage to store information Col. 4, line 66; Col. 5, Line 11) and further teaches a setup logic configured to communicate a setup data for configuring one or more of, the image forming device,

Art Unit: 2146

and the configuration server (configuration server that organize data according to a setup logic configuration of data that correspond to a particular computer Col. 3, Line 39; Col. 4, line 64; FIG. 8), where the setup data is communicated between the image forming device and the configuration server (communications between the system configuration data and the configuration server Col. 12, line 56) whose address is stored in the data store (databases storage to store information Col. 5, Line 11); also teaches a configuration logic configured to automatically configure the image forming device to process alerts (a configuration logic to automatically generate an alert for component replacement Col. 1, Line 61; Col. 2, line 19; Col. 24, Line 34; FIG. 10) handled by one or more of, the image forming device, the posting server, and the communication server based (See details of FIG. 8-10, 12), at least in part, on the setup data but does not teach the specifics of configuring an image forming device. However Van Der Meijs does not teaches a process readable data or a processor and a control unit that store the parameters for configuring a printer or an image-forming device.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Ashley by the teaching of Van Der Meijs et al Because to a processor can execute data in any computer program that is has a set on instructions provided to communicate within a computer device. It is not necessary to have the processor read data from an image-forming device only. It depends on the system implemented in.

. As per claim 4, Both Ashley and Van Der Meijs teach all of the claimed limitations above and Ashley further teach the computer-readable medium of claim 1, including

Art Unit: 2146

processor executable components and processor readable data (a computer accessible medium having a processor that executes instructions and a memory to read data from Col. 7, Line 7; Col. 4, Line 22) of a posting logic configured to selectively communicate a posting data for communicating information associated with an alert between the image forming device and the posting server based (server communication and central processing unit is relied upon to communicate data from one component to another Col. 3, Line 57; Col. 14, Line 27; client to server communication Col. 10, line 13) , at least in part, on the setup data, where the address of the posting server is stored in the data store.

As per claim 5, Both Ashley and Van Der Meijs teach all of the claimed limitations above and Ashley further teach the computer-readable medium of claim 1, where the configuration logic (Col. 3, Line 52; Col. 4, Line 23; Col. 7, Line 7; Col. 22, Line 35; FIG. 10) is further configured to:

- select a posting server with which a posting data for communicating information associated with the alert will be communicated and automatically configuring the image forming device to post the posting data to the posting server (customer configuration server to upload data for customers and automatically generate alerts regarding components Col. 4, line 25; Col. 6, Line 50; Col. 10, Line 54; FIG. 4, 5); and

- select a communication server to distribute an electronic communication associated with the posting data (application server configured to support a specific protocol for server communication that sent email addresses of users Col. 14, Line 27; Col. 14, line 61) and to automatically configure the image forming device to direct the

Art Unit: 2146

posting server to utilize the communication server to distribute the electronic communication (configuration server automatically email explorer to the requesting customers Col. 8, line 20; Col. 17, line 28)

As per claim 6, Both Ashley and Van Der Meijs teach all of the claimed limitations above and Ashley further teach the computer-readable medium of claim 5, where the configuration logic is further configured to associate the alert with a device event (a configuration logic that generates an alert about a component due for replacement Col. 1, Line 60; Col. 24, Line 40; FIG.10)

As per claim 8, Both Ashley and Van Der Meijs teach all of the claimed limitations above and Ashley further teach the computer-readable medium of claim 5, where the posting data includes one or more of, an alert type, an alert data, a set of alert recipient identifiers (the alert maybe a call, a message, a fax, or some other type of alert Col. 24, Line 37) an image forming device address, a posting server address (application server configured to support a specific protocol for server communication that sent email addresses of users Col. 14, Line 27; Col. 14, line 61), and a posting acknowledgment (a notification receipt of a part order number associated with a replacement component Col. 2, Line 45).

As per claim 9, Both Ashley and Van Der Meijs teach all of the claimed limitations above and Ashley further teach the computer-readable medium of claim 5, where the posting data includes one or more of, an alert type, an alert data, a set of alert recipient identifiers (the alert maybe a call, a message, a fax, or some other type of alert Col. 24, Line 37), an image forming device address, and a posting acknowledgment (a

notification receipt of a part order number associated with a replacement component Col. 2, Line 45).

As per claim 10, Both Ashley and Van Der Meijs teach all of the claimed limitations above and Ashley further teach the computer-readable medium of claim 1, including processor executable components and processor readable data (various types of computing devices including servers, routers, processors and memory Col. 3, Line 52; Col. 4, Line 23; Col. 7, Line 7; Col. 22, Line 35; FIG. 10), of a user interface logic configured to facilitate communicating configuration information between a user and the system (a tools interface and input interface that allow various service personal to interact with customers Col. 9, Line 35; Col. 3, Line 59; FIG. 5)

As per claim 17, Both Ashley and Van Der Meijs teach all of the claimed limitations above and Ashley further teach the computer-readable medium of claim 12 including processor executable components and processor readable data of a query logic configured to query the image forming device for non-alert posting data (customer configuration server configured to query databases for system configuration in response to receiving a personal request Col. 5, Line 35; Col. 17, Line 27).

As per claim 18, Both Ashley and Van Der Meijs teach all of the claimed limitations above and Ashley further teach a system that facilitates configuring an image forming device to process alerts (a computer system that has various types of computing devices including servers, storage systems, switches, routers, processor and memory Col. 3, Line 52; Col. 4, Line 23; Col. 7, Line 7; Col. 22, Line 35; FIG. 10), comprising:

an enabled image forming device that includes an alert configuration logic configured to automatically configure the image forming device (a count down monitor configured to automatically generate an alert to users about lifetime of certain component Col. 1, Line 60; Col. 2, Line 7; FIG. 9); and

a configuration server that includes a configuration logic (configuration server that organize data according to a setup logic configuration of data Col. 3, Line 39; Col. 4, line 64; FIG. 8) that facilitates automatically configuring the image forming device to process alerts (a configuration logic to automatically generate an alert for component replacement Col. 1, Line 61; Col. 2, line 19; Col. 24, Line 34; FIG. 10).

As per claim 20, Both Ashley and Van Der Meijs teach all of the claimed limitations above and Ashley further teach the system of claim 18, where the alert configuration logic (a configuration logic to automatically generate an alert for component replacement Col. 1, Line 61; Col. 2, line 19; Col. 24, Line 34; FIG. 10) comprises:

an image forming device memory configured to store an address of one or more of (a computer system that has various types of computing devices including servers, storage systems, processor and memory Col. 3, Line 52; Col. 4, Line 23; Col. 7, Line 7; Col. 22, Line 35; FIG. 10), a configuration server, a posting server, and a communication server;

an image forming device setup logic configured to communicate a setup data (configuration server that organize data according to a setup logic configuration of data that correspond to a particular computer Col. 3, Line 39; Col. 4, line 64; FIG. 8) for

Art Unit: 2146

configuring one or more of, the image forming device, and the configuration server between the image forming device and the configuration server (communications between the system configuration data and the configuration server Col. 12, line 56); and

an image forming device configuration logic configured to automatically configure the image forming device to process alerts (a configuration logic to automatically generate an alert for component replacement Col. 1, Line 61; Col. 2, line 19; Col. 24, Line 34; FIG. 10) based, at least in part, on the setup data.

As per claim 21, Both Ashley and Van Der Meijs teach all of the claimed limitations above and Ashley further teach the system of claim 20, where the configuration logic includes:

a configuration server setup logic configured to communicate the setup data with the image forming device (customer configuration server communicates with the system configuration data for components statues Col. 12, Line 56; Col. 9, Line 48) ;

a configuration server selection logic configured to select a communication server to provide an electronic communication distribution service for the image forming device (application server configured to support a specific protocol for server communication that sent email addresses of users Col. 14, Line 27; Col. 14, line 61) and to select a posting server to provide an alert posting service for the image forming device based, at least in part, on the setup data (customer configuration server to upload data for customers and automatically generate alerts regarding components Col. 4, line 25; Col. 6, Line 50; Col. 10, Line 54);

Art Unit: 2146

a configuration server translation logic configured to receive a posting data for communicating information associated with the alert and to generate an electronic communication based, at least in part, on the posting data (a database table that has a conversion procedure to determine the lifetime of the component Col. 24, Line 26) ; and

a configuration server communication logic configured to communicate the electronic communication to the communication server (server communication and central processing unit is relied upon to communicate data from one component to another Col. 3, Line 57; Col. 14, Line 27; Col. 10, line 13).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claim(s) 2-3, and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ashley Patent No.: (US 6,909,992 B2) as applied to claim 1 and 6 respectively above, and further in view of Zintel et al. Patent No. (US 7,130,895 B2).

Ashley teaches all of the claimed limitation and further teaches a computer system that has various types of computing devices including servers, storage systems, switches, routers, processor and memory for configuration logic to set the lifetime of a component (Col. 3, Line 52; Col. 4, Line 23; Col. 7, Line 7; Col. 22, Line 35) and further teaches the communication between system configuration data and the configuration

server (Col. 12, line 56) but does not teach specifics of what part or component of the system is monitored and configured neither the java instructions configuration used for communications. However, Zintel et al teaches the java scripts and other programming models including java classes to obey instructions for communications and further teaches the system being a printer, scanner, speakers and other devices might be implemented in.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Ashley by the teaching of Zintel et al Because to provide instructions or communicate with the server, one must have such java machine to perform communications. Also, if such system used in a printer it would indicate the major components including the toner, completed jobs, and error files.

7. Claim(s) 23-27, 28-37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ashley Patent No.: (US 6,909,992 B2) as applied to claim 1 and 6 respectively above, and further in view of Grover et al. Patent No. (US 7,155,497 B2).

Ashley teaches all of the claimed limitation and further teaches a computer system that has various types of computing devices including servers, storage systems, switches, routers, processor and memory for configuration logic to set the lifetime of a component (Col. 3, Line 52; Col. 4, Line 23; Col. 7, Line 7) further teaches an alert identifier and a configuration logic to automatically generate an alert for component replacement in various types email message (Col. 2, line 19; Col. 24, Line 34; Col. 24, Line 37) and an application server to provide services to easily maintain user state

Art Unit: 2146

information (Col. 10, Line 20) also teaches an automatic configuration choice to a user (Col. 21, Line 35) Ashley further teaches displaying the data entries on the display and information being displayed on a field form in respond to the data entry selection signal (FIG. 6) but does not teach the essentials of running the system on startup and accessing servers to receive signals and negotiating a level of configuration service for the printer also does not teach on what data is contained on field number.. However, Grover et al. teaches the configuration package start running as soon as the processor powered up or at any convenient time then signals servers to perform requests.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Ashley by the teaching of Grover et al Because to configuration of device always initiated on startup and set logic to-run configuration based on a set time frame. Fields order is just a display and it does not matter what the field contains as long as it displays the information. Also, a processor would connect to all devices connected to it and perform the correct operations set forth to components connected.

Claims 11-16, 19, 22 are related to the same limitation set for hereinabove, where the difference used is the phrase 'ASIC" in claim 11 and 'system' in claims 19 and 21 whereas the wordings of the claims were interchanged within the claim itself and this change does NOT effect the limitation of the above treated claims. The citations from the prior art has been inserted where's necessary. Refer to secondary references for further details. The claim's limitations seemed to be repeated in many claims

Art Unit: 2146

throughout the application. Even in the above treated claims many of the statements were just repeated from previously written claim(s) within the application such as claim 12 where the first part of the claim were introduced in claim 1 and the second part were interdicted in claim 5. Even though claims 11-16, 19, 22 have been differently written from the above treated claims, yet the limitations did NOT change. As mentioned, claim 11 is the same as claim 1, claim 12 is the same as claim 5, claim 13 is the same as claim 6, claim 14 is the same as claim 7, claim 15 is the same as claim 8, claim 16 is the same as claim 9, claim 19 is the same as claim 3, claim 22 is the same as claim 12, again there is no difference in *limitations* between claims 11-16, 19, 22 and the above treated claims.

Conclusion

The following prior art made of record and not relied upon is cited to establish the level of skill in the applicant's art and those arts considered reasonably pertinent to applicant's disclosure. See **MPEP 707.05(c)**.

The following are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor:

- US-20030156874

The examiner requests, in response to this Office action, support should be shown for language added to any original claims on amendment and any new claims. That is, indicate support for newly added claim language by specifically pointing to page(s) and line(s) in the specification and/or drawing figure(s). This will assist the examiner in prosecuting the application.

Art Unit: 2146

When responding to this office action, Applicant is advised to clearly point out the patentable novelty which he or she thinks the claims present, in view of the state of the art disclosed by the references cited or the objections made. He or she must also show how the amendments avoid such references or objections See 37 CFR 1.111(c).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Abdelnabi O. Musa whose telephone number is 571-2701901. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday Thru Friday: 7:30am to 5:00pm (EST).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jeffrey Pwu can be reached on 571-2726798. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

A.M


JEFFREY PWU
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER